

REMARKS

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 2, 6-12, 14, 16-18 and 21-24 were objected to for informalities. The Office Action requested the correction of t-shaped be amended to T-shaped throughout the claims. This amendment has respectfully been implemented throughout and reconsideration is formally requested.

Claim 6, line 2 was identified with an informality regarding "one of the plurality of". The claim has been amended as suggested and reconsideration is formally requested.

Claims Rejected under 35 USC 103(a)

Dutta in view of Marmaropolouos

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-18, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutta in view of Marmaropoulos. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and seeks reconsideration in light of the following arguments.

The Applicant respectfully asserts that neither reference, either alone or in combination, teaches the claimed limitations of the present invention. The configuration of T-shaped main center member housing a power strip on the protected inside, a ground strip on the exposed outside, and a flexible cover (flange) that protects the power strip when the removable modules are removed is (in combination with the additional claim limitations) a unique and novel

structure. The flanges allows such modules to be simply and easily installed and removed by retaining connections and mounting through pressure on the electrical contacts trapped against the t-shaped main center member. Furthermore, the ground strip positioning allows the ground contact to be used with spring characteristics such that sliding of the modules is further enabled.

The Applicant notes that the specification clearly defines the body and cap of the T-shaped main center member. The citation to Marmaropoulos is in error as it fails to teach mounting of the ground on the T-cap as claimed by the present invention. Rather, Marmaropoulos teaches no electrical connections mounted on the T-cap. Neither reference teaches the unique combination of T-shaped, with power strip on the T-body, Ground on the T-cap, and protective flanges to cover the T-body as claimed by the present invention. Neither reference teaches these limitations and therefore the rejection should be removed.

Dutta in view of Tiesler et al.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the aforementioned remarks. In addition, the Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and seeks reconsideration. The Applicant again notes that neither Dutta nor Tiesler, either alone or in combination teach the unique limitations of the present invention. Neither discloses a T-shaped overhead structure having a T-body housing the power strip and an exposed T-cap housing the ground with adjoining flexible flange strip to prevent exposure of said power strip on the T-

body when an electronic module is removed. This is not taught or suggested by either reference either alone or in combination. Therefore, a rejection based on 35 USC 103(a) is unsupported. Reconsideration is formally requested.

In light of the amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all the rejections are now overcome. The Applicants have added no new matter to the application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.



Thomas E. Donohue (44, 660)
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: December 3, 2007